

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by either Tu (U.S. 5,901,822) or Hsieh (U.S. 5,448,756). Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo (U.S. 6,609,271) in view of Kuo (U.S. 6,332,241). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo '271 and further in view of Tiramani et al. (U.S. 6,497,311). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo '271 and further in view of Tsai (U.S. 5,692,266).

Claims 2-4 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) insofar as that handles, referred to in Applicant's claims 6 and 7, were not illustrated in the figures. Since these terms have been deleted from Applicant's amended claims, it is not believed that any drawing corrections are necessary.

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, except as discussed above, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1 and 5-7 and has amended claims 2, 3, 4 and 8 to obviate the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is believed that the amended claims now specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2-4 and 8 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 2 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 2, thus redrafting claim 2 in independent form.

Application No. 10/617,379

Amended claims 3 and 4 each depend from amended claim 2. Applicant's amended claim 8 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 8, thus redrafting claim 8 in independent form. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claims 2 or 8, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2005

By:



Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707